

**GREENWOOD CEMETERY ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 2015 AT 8:30 AM  
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, ROOM 205, 151 MARTIN**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

George Stern, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Kevin Desmond  
Pamela DeWeese  
Darlene Gehringer  
Linda Peterson  
Laura Schreiner  
George Stern  
Barbara Thurber

Administration: Clerk Pierce and Deputy Clerk Arft

Guests: Cheri Arcome of Elmwood Cemetery

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 1, 2015**

**MOTION:** Motion by Gehringer, seconded by Desmond:  
To approve the Greenwood Cemetery Advisory Board minutes of May 1, 2015, as corrected.

VOTE: Ayes: 7  
Nays: None

**III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. MAINTENANCE AND PERPETUAL CARE  
(Recommendation Checklist Item #4)**

Ms. Pierce noted the changes made at the May meeting, specifically in Section IV. Maintenance and Perpetual Care and Section VI. Monuments, Grave Markers and Foundations. If those sections are completed today, the rules and regulations can be brought before the City Commission on June 29, 2015.

Ms. Pierce presented the language suggested for damaged historical markers in Section IV: "The City may maintain the integrity of damaged historical markers through the perpetual care fund." Ms. DeWeese commented that she would prefer the word "may" be changed to "will" or "shall". She suggested that a list of historical markers could be made for the city. It is unlikely family is around to maintain those markers any longer. Ms. DeWeese believes that there are about 15-16 at this time.

The Board agreed the sentence should read "The city shall maintain the integrity of damaged historical markers installed prior to January 1, 1875 through the perpetual care fund."

Mr. Stern shared his concern that the fund does not currently have a great deal of funds.

In Section V., Item c., Ms. DeWeese suggested that the words "injurious to the appearance of the cemetery" are an aesthetic judgment. She suggested that the phrase be changed to "is injurious" or "posts a hazard". Ms. Gehringer suggested it should read "The city shall have the right to remove from any lot any objects including flower pots and benches, etc. that are damaged."

Ms. Schreiner said Item d. covers the injury and maintenance and repair, but Item c., covers the appearance of the cemetery.

Ms. Gehringer suggested that the second sentence should read "the city shall have the right to remove any trees or shrubs that are diseased or pose a hazard."

Mr. Stern concern is that someone has to make the decision about removing a tree. Ms. Schreiner stated the superintendent needs some discretion.

Ms. Arcome noted that tree work is very costly and is not done arbitrarily. She said the cemetery has been maintained well over the last 20 years.

Ms. Gehringer is not comfortable leaving Item c. as is. Her concern is that in the event the city hires a different contractor, they may wish to arbitrarily remove trees and shrubs.

Ms. Schreiner suggested we need to give leeway to address the then current issues. Changes to the rules and regulations can be made at any time if a future board feels that need. She suggested the following revision: "The City Manager shall have the right to remove from any lots any objects including trees, shrubs and flower pots that, in the opinion of the superintendent, are not in keeping with the appearance of the cemetery." The Board agreed to the change.

Mr. Stern asked for any other comments under Section IV. He suggested adding the word "drainage" after water system. The revised sentence would read "The City and/or its Contractor shall be responsible for the maintenance and repair of the driveways, buildings, water system, drainage and fences."

Mr. Stern expressed concern about the second paragraph in Section IV. He believes it is in contradiction to the contract between the City and Elmwood which gives Elmwood the right to sell flowers. Ms. Schreiner suggested adding "Further," to the beginning of the second sentence.

The revised sentence will read, "The City and/or its Contractor shall not be responsible for any special care of any particular section, lot or burial space or for the maintenance or repair of any monument, marker or planting placed by the owner. Further, the City and/or its Contractor shall not contract or agree to give special care to any section, lot or burial space except as above provided. The City may maintain the integrity of damaged historical markers through the perpetual care fund."

Ms. DeWeese noted that the language approved during the previous meeting appeared to be omitted in Section V, Item h., and asked that it be included.

## Section VI. Monuments

Ms. DeWeese asked if we should include a reference prohibiting monuments in flush areas wherever monuments are referred to. Ms. Schreiner suggested that we may want to include something in the definitions, or do a global search throughout the documents.

Ms. Pierce suggested adding Item e., "No monuments will be allowed in flush sections."

Ms. Gehringer requested changing the reference to "him", to "him/her" in Item d.

Discussion followed about the change made at the last meeting permitting a monument on two adjoining graves under one ownership, and orientation. Mr. Stern asked why are we placing a restriction on the width of a monument.

Ms. Pierce suggested the Board could change the language to two adjoining side-by-side graves.

Ms. Schreiner noted that monument size impacts the appearance of the cemetery. Mr. Desmond suggested that if a monument was requested in a non-flush section for a single grave, a beveled marker could be used. Mr. Desmond confirmed for Ms. Thurber that monuments may be custom-made, but are costly. Most monuments sold are standard dimensions.

Mr. Stern noted that markers have been defined in the Rules and Regulations as 18" in height, 16" in width and 24" inches in length. Monuments are defined as anything larger than a marker. Objects, such as statues are permitted.

Ms. Gehringer requested a change in Item d., changing "workmen" to "workers".

### Markers

Mr. Desmond asked for clarification in Item c. as to whether the City must approve the size, material and design or does the contractor approve. Ms. Schreiner suggested the "City or its designated contractor" be used.

Mr. Stern asked to remove Item b. entirely and specify that markers must have a concrete foundation. Ms. Pierce clarified that monuments are required to be set on a concrete foundation. She noted that repairing concrete foundations is difficult and costly. Those costs are passed on to the family. Markers not set on concrete are easier and less expensive to repair. Ms. Arcome noted that Greenwood is on sandy soil, so settling occurs here much more often in that condition.

Mr. Valentine noted that changes to the rules and regulations can be made in the future as needed.

Ms. Schreiner asked about the reference to memorial in Item c. Ms. Arcome said that the word "memorial" encompasses markers and monuments.

Ms. DeWeese suggested adding a definition for memorial. "Memorial shall refer to marker or monument."

Flush Memorial Section – F North only

Ms. Schreiner would like the references to the "City" in Item c be changed to add "or its designated contractor".

Ms. Pierce noted for Ms. Schreiner that both bronze and granite markers have traditionally been permitted in this section. Ms. Arcome added that bronze is very costly and is subject to theft, and this area is located at the front of the cemetery. Ms. Pierce said if the Board chooses to add bronze to the section plotted after January 1, 2015, it may do so.

Flush Memorial Section – Areas Plotted after January 1, 2015

In Item b., Ms. Thurber suggested that bronze markers be offered as well as granite markers, with the stipulation that the customers are told about the specific issues relative to bronze. The Board agreed to add the language "acceptable bronze or" before the word "granite"

The words "or its designated contractors" are to be added throughout the rules and regulations where the word "City" appears.

Section VII.

Funerals, Interments and Disinterments

Mr. Stern said he knows of no funeral director or vault company who installs a casket. Discussion followed on this practice as it relates to Greenwood Cemetery. It was emphasized that Greenwood does not sell vaults, therefore, a contractor is hired for the installation of a casket.

Mr. Stern wants the language clarified to read that the cemetery installs the casket. Ms. Gehringer pointed out that the City does not own equipment to install caskets. Ms. Arcome added that Greenwood does not sell vaults, and that the vault company or the contractor installs the casket.

MOTION: Motion by Gehringer, seconded by Desmond, to add the word "then" between "container" and "shall".

Ms. Schreiner suggested that might result in a timing issue, and suggested two sentences. Ms. Gehringer withdrew her motion.

Ms. Schreiner confirmed with Mr. Desmond that at Greenwood the funeral director has always handled the installation of the casket. Mr. Desmond stated that it is standard practice for the family to purchase the vault from the funeral home.

MOTION: Motion by Gehringer seconded by Peterson:  
To amend the language as follows: In all full burial interments, the casket shall be enclosed in a permanent outside container. The container shall be installed by the funeral director, vault company or the city's designated contractor.

VOTE: Ayes: 4  
Nays: 3 (Desmond, DeWeese, Thurber)

MOTION: Motion by Gehringer, seconded by Peterson  
To schedule a special meeting on Friday, June 19, 2015 at 8:30 AM

VOTE: Ayes 7  
Nays None

Ms. Pierce stated that the terms expire for Ms. Peterson, Ms. Schreiner and Mr. Stern on July 5<sup>th</sup>. Applications should be submitted to the Clerk no later than July 8th at noon. Interviews will be held at the July 13<sup>th</sup> City Commission meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 AM.

/ca